

Anthony L. Martin  
Nevada Bar No. 8177  
[anthony.martin@ogletreedeakins.com](mailto:anthony.martin@ogletreedeakins.com)  
Dana B. Salmonson  
Nevada Bar No. 11180  
[dana.salmonson@ogletreedeakins.com](mailto:dana.salmonson@ogletreedeakins.com)  
OGLETREE, DEAKINS, NASH, SMOAK & STEWART, P.C.  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 1500  
Las Vegas, NV 89169  
Telephone: 702.369.6800  
Fax: 702.369.6888  
  
Patrick F. Hulla (*admitted pro hac vice*)  
[patrick.hulla@ogletreedeakins.com](mailto:patrick.hulla@ogletreedeakins.com)  
OGLETREE, DEAKINS, NASH, SMOAK & STEWART, P.C.  
4520 Main Street, Ste. 400  
Kansas City, MO 64111  
Telephone: 816.471.1301  
Fax: 816.471.1303  
*Attorney for Defendant Venetian Casino Resort, LLC*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

MUSTAFA YOUSIF and SHARONE  
WALKER on behalf of themselves and all  
others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

LAS VEGAS SAND CORP.; THE  
VENETIAN CASINO RESORT, LLC; and  
DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 2:16-cv-02941-RFB-NJK

**STIPULATION AND ORDER TO EXTEND  
TIME TO RESPOND TO PLAINTIFFS'  
MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION  
UNDER RULE 23 OF THE FEDERAL  
RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE**

*(First Request)*

Pursuant to Local Rules IA 6-1, IA 6-2 and LR 7-1, Defendant Venetian Casino Resort, LLC (“Defendant”), and Plaintiffs Mustafa Yousif and Sharone Walker (collectively referred to as “Plaintiffs”) hereby request a three-week extension of time, up to and including, May 13, 2019, for Defendant to file its Response to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Class Certification.<sup>1</sup> Plaintiffs filed their

<sup>1</sup> Las Vegas Sands Corp. was dismissed from this matter on October 10, 2018. (ECF No. 113.)

1 Motion for Class Certification on April 1, 2019 (“Motion”). (ECF No. 126.) The present deadline  
2 for Defendant to file its Response to the Motion is April 22, 2019. This is Defendant’s first request  
3 for an extension of time to file its Response.

4 This Stipulation is not intended for delay, and is made in good faith so the parties may  
5 conclude a meet-and-confer regarding evidence submitted by Plaintiffs in support of their Motion.  
6 Specifically, Plaintiffs rely on the purported expert testimony of analyst James R. Toney in their  
7 Motion. (ECF No. 126, p. 26.) However, Defendants believe that Plaintiffs should have disclosed  
8 Mr. Toney as a witness under Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 26(a)(1), or as an expert witness under Fed. R. Civ.  
9 Pro. 26(a)(2), prior to using his testimony in support of their Motion. “Expert reports are required  
10 in order to eliminate ‘unfair surprise to the opposing party and [to conserve] resources.’” *Williams*  
11 *v. University Medical Center of Southern Nev.*, 2010 WL 2802214 (D. Nev. July 14, 2010) (*citing*  
12 *Elgas v. Colorado Belle Corp.*, 179 F.R.D. 296, 299 (D. Nev. 1998)). Further, while the original  
13 Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order (“DPSO”) did not set a date for disclosure of experts or the  
14 close of discovery, it did set forth a two-phase discovery structure whereby the first phase of  
15 discovery “will focus on the appropriate scope of any motion for conditional and/or class  
16 certification and Plaintiffs’ individual claims for all (3) classes.” (ECF No. 42 at section  
17 G.) Because Plaintiffs knew they would use Mr. Toney’s analysis in their Motion for Class  
18 Certification, it was within the scope of discovery and should have been disclosed under the DPSO.  
19 Moreover, at the class certification stage, any proffered expert testimony must undergo an analysis  
20 under *Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc.*, 509 U.S. 579, 591, 113 S. Ct. 2786 (1993) to  
21 test the evidence for scientific reliability and relevance. *See Ellis v. Costco Wholesale Corp.*, 657  
22 F.3d 970, 982 (9th Cir. 2011). Plaintiffs’ failure to disclose Mr. Toney or his report deprived  
23 Defendants of the opportunity to depose Mr. Toney and to test the reliance of his opinions. *See*  
24 *Brown v. Wal-Mart Store, Inc.*, 2018 WL 2011935 (N. D. Cal. 2018) (Court reiterated that Wal-  
25 Mart’s failure to disclose the identities of fifteen declarants before filing an opposition to Plaintiff’s  
26 motion for class certification “deprived [Plaintiffs] of the opportunity to depose these declarants”  
27 and that the exclusion of this evidence was justified (noting that the Ninth Circuit upheld the  
28 imposition of that sanction on appeal).)

1 Plaintiffs disagree due to the facts that (1) no expert disclosure deadline has been set by the  
2 Court, and (2) no trial dates have been set. *See Torres v. White*, 685 F. Supp. 2d 1283, 1286 (N.D.  
3 Okla. 2010) (“Plaintiff’s expert report was timely disclosed under the Federal Rules of Civil  
4 Procedure as this court did not set a specific time frame for the identification of expert witnesses or  
5 the exchange of witness reports. Absent a specific date set by the court or a stipulation by the parties,  
6 Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(2)(C)(i) dictates that disclosure of experts must be made 90 days before trial.  
7 Since there was no trial date set in this matter, plaintiff’s disclosure was timely.”); *see also, Minebea*  
8 *Co. Ltd. v. Papst*, 231 F.R.D. 3, 6-7 (D.D.C. 2005) (“Purpose of rule requiring that expert reports be  
9 disclosed at least 90 days before the trial date or as directed by the court is to prevent unfair surprise  
10 at trial and to permit the opposing party to prepare rebuttal reports, to depose the expert in advance  
11 of trial, and to prepare for depositions and cross-examination at trial.”).

12 On April 9, 2019, Defendant’s counsel contacted Plaintiffs’ counsel to meet-and-confer  
13 regarding Plaintiffs’ reliance on Mr. Toney’s testimony, their failure to disclose him as a witness,  
14 and their failure to disclose his expert report. Counsel for Plaintiffs responded that they do not  
15 believe they were required to disclose Mr. Toney prior to relying on his expert testimony but that  
16 they would provide a position on the propriety of Mr. Toney’s analysis by Friday, April 12, 2019 or  
17 Monday, April 15, 2019. Counsel also stated they would be available to discuss this matter after  
18 Defendants’ counsel has had an opportunity to review their response. On April 15, 2019, Plaintiffs’  
19 counsel sent correspondence to Defendant’s counsel regarding why it did not believe an expert  
20 disclosure prior to filing their Motion was required. Further, Plaintiffs’ counsel indicated that they  
21 anticipated providing Defendant with Plaintiffs’ Expert Disclosure for Mr. Toney “likely before the  
22 end of the week, 4/19/19”.

23 ...

24 ...

25 ...

26 ...

27 ...

28 ...

As a result, the parties respectfully request a three-week extension of time for Defendant to respond to Plaintiffs' Motion and to allow for a meet-and-confer with Plaintiffs to be fully conducted, to review and analyze Mr. Toney's expert report, to determine whether a rebuttal expert is necessary at this time, and to explore whether and to what extent a Motion to Strike Mr. Toney is appropriate.

DATED this 17th day of April, 2019.

THIERMAN BUCK LLP

/s/ Leah L. Jones

Mark R. Thierman  
Nevada Bar No. 8285  
Joshua D. Buck  
Nevada Bar No. 12187  
Joshua R. Hendrickson  
Nevada Bar No. 12225  
Leah L. Jones  
Nevada Bar No. 13161  
7287 Lakeside Drive  
Reno, NV 89511  
*Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

DATED this 17th day of April, 2019.

OGLETREE, DEAKINS, NASH, SMOAK & STEWART,  
P.C.

/s/ Dana B. Salmonson

Anthony L. Martin  
Nevada Bar No. 8177  
Dana B. Salmonson  
Nevada Bar No. 11180  
Wells Fargo Tower  
Suite 1500  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Las Vegas, NV 89169

Patrick F. Hulla (*admitted pro hac vice*)  
4520 Main Street, Ste. 400  
Kansas City, MO 64111  
*Attorneys for Defendant*

**ORDER**

IT IS SO ORDERED.



RICHARD F. BOULWARE, II  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

April 18, 2019

DATED